

HEINE'S RUSSIAN DOPPELGÄNGER: NINETEENTH-CENTURY TRANSLATIONS OF HIS POETRY

Heine's poem 'Still ist die Nacht, es ruhen die Gassen'¹ ('The night is still, the streets are dumb'),² written in the early 1820s, describes a nocturnal encounter between the poet and his double. The poet returns to stand under the window of the house where his beloved once lived, only to find his double on duty in his place. To the poet, the double's sighs and hand-wringing seem to be a mocking parody of his own genuine, deeply felt emotions, which leads him to ask: 'Was äffst du nach mein Liebesleid [. . .]?' (p. 167) ('why do you ape the pains and woe that racked my heart on this same spot?' (p. 85)). Readers may feel something similar when confronted by a less than inspired translation of a poem which they know well. A translation, like Heine's double, purports to be the same as the original, but is not and cannot be identical with it. In all probability, some aspects of the original have been omitted, other elements added, and, in mediocre translations, certain features may have been exaggerated in ways which verge on unintentional parody. Certainly Russian literary critics of the mid-nineteenth century believed that some contemporary translations of Heine's poetry came dangerously close to parody. One likened Heine's Russian translators to huntsmen pursuing the poet as their unfortunate quarry, while another commented that if Heine were alive today and knew Russian, he would sue his translators for damages.³ The idea of Heine's clumsy translators as unwitting parodists inspired humorous verse:

Прочитал я «Книгу песен»
Гейне в русском переводе,
Прочитал и ужаснулся:
Это . . . это нечто в роде
Преобиднейших пародий
Полных смысла искаженья!
Что за грубость выраженья! . . .
Мысль для рифмы и цензуры
Пресмыкается позорно.
Даже мне бы подписаться
Под таким слишком зазорно! . . .
Слава Богу не велик я:

I would like to thank colleagues who made helpful comments on earlier versions of this article, particularly Martina Lauster and Gert Vonhoff of the Department of German at Exeter. All translations from Russian are my own.

¹ Heinrich Heine, *Sämtliche Gedichte in zeitlicher Folge*, ed. by Klaus Briegleb (Frankfurt a.M. and Leipzig: Insel, 1993), p. 167. Further references to this edition are given in the text.

² All English translations of Heine's poetry are taken from Hal Draper, *The Complete Poems of Heinrich Heine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982). Further references to this edition are given in the text.

³ N. Dobroliubov, 'Pesni Geine v perevode M. L. Mikhailova', *Sobranie sochinenii*, 9 vols (Moscow and Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1962), II, 488; P. Olesin, 'Novaia istoricheskaia kniga ili perevody sochinenii Geine v izdanii F. N. Berga', *Iskra*, 4 (1864), quoted by Ia. I. Gordon, *Heine in Rußland, 1830–1860*, trans. by Eva-Marie Fiedler (Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe, 1982), p. 309.

Лишь умру — меня забудут
И терзать меня как Гейне
Переводчики не будут.⁴

I read Heine's *Book of Songs* in Russian translation, read it and was horrified: it's . . . it's something like the most vicious parody full of distorted meanings! What coarseness of expression! The ideas cringe shamefully for the sake of the rhyme and the censor. Even I would feel it too disgraceful to sign my name under that kind of thing! . . . Thank God I am not great: as soon as I die I will be forgotten and translators will not torment me as they have tormented Heine.

A distinct subgenre of Heine-related parody developed in Russian from the middle of the nineteenth century. Readers were presented with poems which claimed to be translations from or imitations of Heine, but which displayed, in concentrated form, the failings of his heavy-handed translators. Parodies of this kind are not concerned with ridiculing the parodied text, but, as Margaret A. Rose puts it, represent a wish to 'defend the parodied text as having been reduced to parody by its imitation by other writers and poetasters, or by the misreadings of readers or critics'.⁵ The main concern of this article, however, is to examine some of the mid-nineteenth-century Russian translations of Heine's poetry which were offered to contemporary readers, and investigate why critics felt the need to defend his work from deliberate or unintentional parody. It will also consider the reasons for Heine's great popularity in Russia from the mid-1850s to the 1870s, given the unfavourable critical response to many available translations. The Heine-related parodies are helpful here as an indication of how the poet was seen in the popular imagination.

There are two principal factors which can help to explain contemporary critical responses to translations of Heine's poetry: the debates on the relationship between art and society, and the relegation of poetic form and style to the margins of literary concern. The two are interrelated, and manifest themselves in mid-nineteenth-century Russian translations through the effect known as domestication. Lawrence Venuti sums up the phenomenon of domestication as follows:

The aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar, and often in highly self-conscious projects, where translation serves as an appropriation of foreign culture for domestic agendas, cultural, economic, political. Translation can be considered the communication of a foreign text, but it is always a communication limited by its address to a specific reading audience.⁶

The Russian domestic agenda, at the time when the bulk of nineteenth-century translations of Heine's poetry were produced, was dominated by debates on the social significance of literature; literary craftsmanship was seen by the majority as being of secondary importance. The agenda was dictated by polemical debates between the increasingly dominant radicals and the conservatives. The radicals' chief representatives were the critics Nikolai Chernyshevskii and

⁴ 'Graf Bengal'skii' (pseudonym of N. G. Shebuev), *Razvlechenie*, 31 (1898), 4, quoted by Ia. I. Gordon, *Geine v Rossii: XX vek* (Dushanbe: Donish, 1983), p. 64.

⁵ *Parody // Meta-Fiction: An Analysis of Parody as a Critical Mirror to the Writing and Reception of Fiction* (London: Croon Helm, 1979), p. 22.

⁶ *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 19–20.

Nikolai Dobroliubov, together with Dmitrii Pisarev, who wrote prolifically on Heine. Their aim was to create a generation of young Russians who would question the older generation's received opinions and accept only such ideas as were consistent with the natural sciences. Their materialist and utilitarian outlook informed their ideas on art as a means to describe existing social reality in order to criticize this reality and point the way to a better future. They rejected the idea that art might belong to a sphere which was superior to or separate from ordinary reality. Instead, art was to serve as a 'textbook of life'.⁷ Those on the conservative side felt such views to be a threat both to artistic values and to literary freedom. Figures such as A. V. Druzhinin, Vasilii Botkin, and Pavel Annenkov held that literature should concentrate on artistic values rather than on class conflict or topical concerns. The broadly radical 'realists' and the broadly conservative proponents of 'pure art' clashed in their views on poetry, one area where authors' allegiance to one side or the other could emerge with particular clarity. The famous lines of Nikolai Nekrasov, figurehead of the 'realist' school of poetry and editor of the journal *Sovremennik*, offered up the criterion by which poets should be measured:

Поэтом можешь ты не быть,
Но гражданином быть обязан.⁸

You do not have to be a poet, but you are obliged to be a citizen.

A selective treatment of Heine's work enabled him to be deployed by both sides in the Russian literary debate; translations which promoted a rival interpretation of the poet could provoke accusations of wilful distortion. Heine could be made to stand for the values of Romanticism, for emotional and aesthetic refinement which set the artist apart from society, as well as for a realism which allowed the artist to criticize society with a view to effecting its transformation. His poetry could be interpreted as embodying the value of 'pure art', and as an example of a writer's political engagement. Heine could be represented as an opponent of autocracy (in spite of his sympathy for the institution of monarchy) and as a supporter of revolution (in spite of his suspicions that revolution would create a world in which his poetry would have no place). His work, considered as a whole, does not support the view of Heine either as the unequivocally committed supporter of revolution that his radical admirers would have him be or as the apolitical aesthete that conservative figures preferred.⁹ The ambivalence at the heart of Heine's writing and thought did not survive the transition to the Russian context, partly because of the opposing camps' efforts to co-opt the poet for their own purposes, and partly because the subtle stylistic means which convey Heine's ambivalence were largely overlooked by his translators.

⁷ Nikolai Chernyshevskii, 'Esteticheskie otnosheniia iskusstva k deistvitel'nosti', *Izbrannye esteticheskie proizvedeniia*, 2nd edn (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1978), p. 169.

⁸ 'Poet i grazhdanin', *Izbrannye sochineniia* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1945), p. 49.

⁹ Chernyshevskii and, later, Pisarev came to see Heine as something of a political dilettante, even though they recognized his poetic talent. See Pisarev, 'Genrikh Geine', *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 6 vols (St Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1894), II, 254–304, and Chernyshevskii's letter to his son A. N. Chernyshevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 16 vols (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1939–53), xv (1950), 508–09. See Ritchie Robertson, *Heinrich Heine* (London: Halban, 1988), for a lucid discussion of Heine as a thinker.

The poet Aleksandr Blok, whose translations of Heine may be considered as a benchmark against which other translations may be compared, wrote in 1919 about the shortcomings of his nineteenth-century predecessors: 'It would be no exaggeration to say that in spite of the fact that all the best Russian journals, starting from the 1840s, have published in their pages translations from Heine, often belonging to the pens of first-class poets, the Russian language still hardly knows Heine at all.'¹⁰ In Blok's opinion, the translators had been preoccupied with conveying their own liberal views, even when translating texts which were not concerned with 'civic' themes. They had created a 'weighty, ten-ton liberal legend of Heine'. Almost all the translators, moreover, had neglected the formal attributes of Heine's texts, failing to search for equivalent metres and frequently departing from the rhyme-scheme of the original.¹¹

Historical circumstances had not served Heine well when it came to his reception in Russia. His prose began to be translated in the 1830s, and later in the decade Fedor Tiutchev made the first published translations of his poetry. Tiutchev, who was personally acquainted with Heine, produced translations which, though they generally adopted a rather solemn and archaic tone, are impressive poems which handle Heine's metre and rhyme skilfully. Tiutchev's translations were, however, largely forgotten as Heine's poetry gradually attracted more translators in the 1840s.¹² Since this article focuses on translations which were widely known in the mid-nineteenth century, and on their relationship with the contemporary literary-political scene, Tiutchev's translations, in spite of their high quality, fall outside the scope of the current discussion. Further developments in the Russian reception of Heine were delayed when a near-total ban on the poet and his works was imposed in 1848 in response to the revolutionary events in Europe. When the ban was finally lifted in 1855, and the Russian public was able to gain access to a rapidly growing selection of Heine's work, the literary situation had changed and the radicals were steadily gaining the upper hand. Heine provided them with a convenient example of the politically committed poet-citizen, and the conservatives with an example of the artist compromised by tendentiousness. The reception of Heine was therefore fragmented as each side claimed that those aspects of his work which were congenial to their views represented the 'real' Heine. Moreover, by the time that a significant selection Heine's poetry started to reach Russian readers, translation had become largely the concern of full-time professionals with a generally utilitarian culture of translation, which aimed to make a broad range of foreign texts accessible to Russian readers, to enlighten them about Western European literature, and, in some cases, to establish a tradition of Russian political poetry. Translation was no longer principally an activity in which poets engaged as a means to develop their own style and introduce new thematic or formal elements into Russian poetry, as had been the case in the 1830s when Heine was first translated. In the mid-nineteenth century Heine's poetry was

¹⁰ 'Geine v Rossii: o russkikh perevodakh stikhotvorenii Geine', *Sobranie sochinenii*, 8 vols (Moscow and Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1960–63), VI (1962), 116.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 121, 119.

¹² See Iurii Tynianov, 'Tiutchev i Geine', *Poetika, istoriia literatury, kino* (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), pp. 350–95.

a commodity which enjoyed considerable demand, and translators of widely varying talent were happy to meet it.

It was not Heine's qualities as an artist which made him a much-discussed figure in the mid-nineteenth-century literary arena, but his perceived social and political significance. The radicals emphasized Heine's role as citizen and model of civic commitment. His ambivalence about revolution drew little attention, though Pisarev would later come to see Heine as a political dilettante. Initially Pisarev saw in Heine the epitome of modern man, whose sufferings revealed the repressive nature of the age:

We see in him a martyr of our century, unacknowledged by his countrymen, forced to leave his homeland because of the intellectual timidity and stereotyped views of philistines—broken down by illness and slowly dying far from friends, in an alien city, among gloomy impressions. The sufferings of the great poet are dear to us as Caesar's blood-stained garments were to Mark Antony, they are dear to us as a reproach to our century, which is proud of its tolerance and freedom of thought, as a condemnation of the ideas and way of life which tormented an honest man and a genius with its ugliness.¹³

Heine's cultural 'otherness' was easily obscured, since there were several points of contact between Heine's Germany and Russia of the 1860s. Russian radicals responded to Heine's satirical evocations of Germany as a hidebound, reactionary, hierarchical society dominated by bureaucracy, and came to see satire as central to his work. Heine's appeals for freedom and social justice had resonance for them too, as did his predicament as a poet in exile. For the radicals Heine offered a symbol of personal emancipation and political revolution. Pisarev saw him as a touchstone for assessing a person's radical credentials: 'It seems to me that a person's level of intellectual development can be determined and measured at once by the manner in which, and the extent to which he understands Heinrich Heine's work as a poet.'¹⁴ The conservatives, by contrast, saw Heine primarily as a talented artist who, unlike Goethe, an exemplar of a pure poet, unfortunately allowed his work to be compromised by his attempts at tendentiousness, and by his destructive irony.¹⁵ Druzhinin, editor of *Biblioteka dlia chteniia*, commented on the harmful effect of Heine's 'concern for the didactic' and was anxious that he might exercise a damaging influence on the young.¹⁶ Such reservations did not, however, prevent Druzhinin from publishing numerous translations of Heine's poetry in his journal. The criticisms levelled at Heine by conservatives in the 1830s were repeated in the 1860s: he was contradictory, and showed no commitment to any one political standpoint, or to his country. His irony caused particular unease. Writing in 1852, at the time of the ban on Heine, Apollon Grigor'ev quoted extensively from his work, without mentioning the poet's name, in order to demonstrate the destructive effect of irony. For Grigor'ev, the poems' preoccupation with unhappiness was

¹³ 'Posmertnye stikhotvoreniia Geine. Dichtungen von H. Heine', *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 1, 533.

¹⁴ 'Realisty', *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, IV, 103.

¹⁵ German Ritz, *150 Jahre russische Heine-Übersetzung* (Bern and Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1981), p. 153. See also André von Gronicka, *The Russian Image of Goethe*, 2 vols (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968), II, 55–56.

¹⁶ Quoted by Ia. I. Gordon, in *Heine in Rußland, 1830–1860*, p. 161.

symptomatic of modern man's over-developed sense of subjectivity.¹⁷ Where Pisarev had looked for the causes of Heine's suffering in his social environment, Grigor'ev looked for spiritual or psychological flaws, though both saw Heine as a distinctively modern poet.

While literary criticism provided the dominant arena for Heine-related polemic, translations also offered some scope for radicals and conservatives to promote their rival interpretations of the poet. To a certain extent the choice of text could indicate where the translator's sympathies lay. The more conservative-minded tended to concentrate on his lyrics on love and nature, while his satire found its translators mainly among the radicals. On occasion, though, the same poem received a very different treatment from translators whose desire to make a polemical point led them to add elements which distorted or misrepresented the original text. The poem 'Nun ist es Zeit, daß ich mit Verstand' ('It's time I took good sense to heart'), from *Buch der Lieder*, offers an example of the different interpretations that translators could impose on Heine's work. The speaker in Heine's poem renounces play-acting, only to realize that the feelings he expressed as part of a pose were, in fact, genuine. The poem can be read as an episode in the relationship between the speaker and a female addressee, the object of the speaker's inadvertently serious affections, as it belongs in a cycle charting the pains of disappointed love. Yet it can also be read as a poetological statement about the renunciation of artifice. Apollon Maikov's translation emphasizes theatricality and pretence, reflecting conservative criticisms of Heine's inability to be sincere. Moreover, Maikov interprets Heine's text as a poetological statement in which the poet expresses his despair at having set aside his old, artificial poetry, since his new ironic poetry leaves no room at all for sincerity.¹⁸ Aleksei Pleshcheev, whose sympathies lay with the radicals, pays more attention to the pathos of the speaker's predicament, and adheres far more closely to the letter of Heine's original text than Maikov, although he does not quite convey its mood. The original suggests that the speaker's habit of pretence is directed towards one person in particular, the addressee, when it refers to his acting out a role 'mit dir' (with you):

Nun ist es Zeit, daß ich mit Verstand
 Mich aller Torheit entled'ge;
 Ich hab so lang als ein Komödiant
 Mit dir gespielt die Komödie.

(p. 212)

It's time I took good sense to heart
 And put all folly away:
 Too long I've only been playing a part
 Like an actor in a play.

(p. 95)

Maikov's first stanza makes a statement about the speaker's approach to the world in general:

¹⁷ 'Russkaia iziashchnaia literatura v 1852 g.', *Literaturnaia kritika* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1967), p. 94.

¹⁸ Ritz, pp. 163–64.

Пора, пора за ум мне взяться!
 Пора отбросить этот вздор,
 С которым в мир привык являться
 Я, как напыщенный актёр!¹⁹

It's time, it's time, to come to my senses! It's time to throw off the nonsense with which I am accustomed to appear in society, like a bombastic actor.

Maikov's style is more emphatic than that of the original. He is far more generous with exclamation marks, and uses repetition prominently, as, for example, the threefold *pora* (it is time) in the first two lines. He adds the adjective *napyshchennyi* (pompous, bombastic) to the speaker's description of himself as an actor, thus intensifying the idea of excess and insincerity. While Heine's second stanza makes reference to theatrical trappings of scenery and costume, his insincerity has an elevated tinge to it:

Die prächt'gen Kulissen, sie waren bemalt
 Im hochromantischen Stile,
 Mein Rittermantel hat goldig gestrahlt,
 Ich fühlte die feinsten Gefühle.

(p. 212)

The painted settings were splendid and bright
 In highly romantic fashion;
 My mantle was spangled with gold like a knight,
 I voiced the loftiest passion.

(p. 95)

The second stanza of Maikov's translation endows the theatrical trappings with a pejorative implication not present in the original:

Смешно все в мантии иль тоге,
 С партера не сводя очей,
 Читать в надутым монологе
 Анализ сердца и страстей! . . .²⁰

It's ridiculous, always in a cloak or toga, never shifting my eyes from the stalls, to recite in an overblown monologue an analysis of the heart and passions!

Where Heine has a knight's cloak, suggestive of chivalry, Maikov mentions two costumes, a cloak and a toga, suggestive of inconsistency in the speaker's choice of roles. Heine's scenery depicts medieval magnificence, while Maikov directs his gaze and the speaker's 'overblown monologue' towards the stalls. Any hint of elevated feeling that is implied in mentions of the 'highly romantic fashion', the 'loftiest passion', is removed. Maikov's translation of this stanza diverges markedly from the original. This is not a case of the translator failing to notice subtle points of Heine's text or being unable to find adequate ways of rendering them, but of a translator imposing his own interpretation on the text, and forcing Heine to condemn himself for his own insincerity.

Pleshcheev's translation reads rather differently. Instead of giving prominence to Heine's theatrical imagery, he begins by foregrounding the speaker's decision to apply reason to his plight:

¹⁹ 'Pora, pora za um mne vziat'sia!', *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1977), p. 189.

²⁰ Ibid.

Пора оставить эту шутку
И заученные слова!
Давно холодному рассудку
Пора вступить в свои права.²¹

It's time to set aside this joke and the words I've learnt by heart! It is high time for cold reason to come into its own.

Where reason is mentioned in the first line of the original, here it takes up the whole of lines three and four, while reference to play-acting is made far less prominent. Maikov speaks of a 'bombastic actor', but Pleshcheev speaks merely of 'words learnt by heart'. The overall tone of the two translations is very different. Maikov makes frequent mentions of laughter (*smekh*) and describes his speaker's predicament as ridiculous (*smeshno*), coarsening the original text's implied laughter in the phrase *im Scherz* (in jest) and *Torheit* (folly). Pleshcheev is far more solemn, tending towards pathos, when, for example, he translates Heine's 'sprach ich, was ich gefühlet' (what I felt I spoke) with 'правдивым был я до конца' (I was truthful in the utmost). While the conservatives' Heine is compromised by his own insincerity, the radicals' Heine is a figure who shares the plight of a would-be progressive in the oppressive world of reactionary tsarist Russia, unable to liberate himself from his predicament, despite his best intentions. Consequently Heine's irony and ambivalence are discarded in favour of pathos, his moderately colloquial, down-to-earth expression is replaced by more elevated phrases.

A similar approach can be seen in Pleshcheev's translation of another poem from *Buch der Lieder*, 'Das Herz ist mir bedrückt, und sehnlich' ('My heart is heavy—sad the present'). The original text laments the inhospitable and disjointed world of the present, though with a certain amount of self-mockery. Pleshcheev's speaker takes himself altogether more seriously, and emphasizes the deathliness of the modern world. The contrast between the second stanza in the original and in translation is a sharp one:

Doch jetzt ist alles wie verschoben,
Das ist ein Drängen! eine Not!
Gestorben ist der Herrgott oben,
Und unten ist der Teufel tot.
(p. 222)

Now helter-skelter, elbows shove us,
Pressure and stress on every side!
Dead is the good Lord God above us,
And down below the devil's died.
(p. 93)

This is a world which is distressingly out of joint and full of urgency; death is confined to the rulers of heaven and hell. Pleshcheev's entire world appears to be lifeless:

А теперь . . . несносно . . . вяло . . .
Словно вымер целый свет.

²¹ 'Pora ostavit' etu shutku', *Izbrannoe* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1960), p. 364.

На земле исчезли черти,
И на небе бога нет.²²

But now . . . it's intolerable . . . vapid . . . as if the whole world had died. The demons on earth have vanished, and there is no god in heaven.

The final stanza of Heine's poem produces a vision of the speaker's near-total disorientation, with love as the only fixed point that can be relied on:

Und alles schaut so grämlich trübe,
So krausverwirrt und morsch und kalt,
Und wäre nicht das bißchen Liebe,
So gäb' es nirgends einen Halt.
(p. 222)

Everything goes in churlish fashion,
A rotten, tangled, cold affair;
And but for a little love and passion
There'd be no surcease anywhere.
(p. 93)

Pleshcheev offers an evocation of a living death, with a veiled threat of suicide:

Все так мрачно . . . отовсюду
Веет холодом могил;
И не будь любви немножко,
Право, жить не стало б сил!²³

Everything is so dark . . . from all directions the cold of the grave wafts; and if it weren't for a little love, truly, there would be no strength to live!

The later poem 'Doktrin' ('Doctrine'), part of the cycle *Zeitgedichte* of 1844, was also translated by Pleshcheev, and played a major role in promoting Heine as an ally of the radicals.²⁴ The speaker, beating his drum to rouse the people to revolution, is interpreted as a symbol of the poet's duty to call for radical action. The sly hints, in the original text, of the speaker's self-satisfaction in his simplistic and limited outlook, are replaced in translation by pathos. The final stanza of the original, like the previous two, affirms that all of the learning to be gained from books can be reduced to beating the drum and leading the march to revolution:

Das ist die Hegelsche Philosophie,
das ist der Bücher tiefster Sinn!
Ich habe sie begriffen, weil ich gescheit,
und weil ich ein guter Tambour bin.
(p. 467)

That's Hegel's philosophy in short,
That's the deepest wisdom books bestow!
I understand it, because I'm smart,
I'm a good drummer-boy myself: I know.
(p. 392)

While Heine's irony implies the speaker's unreflecting self-satisfaction in its final two lines, Pleshcheev's translation provides a different picture:

²² 'Skuchno mne! I v zor kidaiu', *Izbrannoe*, p. 330.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ritz, p. 155

Вот Гегель! Вот книжная мудрость!
 Вот дух философских начал!
 Давно я постиг эту тайну,
 Давно барабанщиком стал!²⁵

That's Hegel! That's the wisdom of books! That's the spirit of philosophical origins! I have long since unravelled this mystery, I have long since become a drummer!

Pleshcheev creates a more elevated mood by the repetition of *davno* (long since) at the start of the third and fourth lines, and by his speaker's claim that he has 'unravelled a mystery', instead of the original boast of how 'smart' he is; his drumming is more obviously a metaphorical activity than a noisy mechanical pursuit.

The examples of translations by Maikov and Pleshcheev given above show how their work is affected by the translators' political outlook. This is not to say that their translations are without merit, but that they select and foreground different aspects of the original text:

There are no translations which are simply just good or bad, none is ideal or canonical. No one translation can convey the original absolutely: every translator selects from the original only what is essential, and lets this predominate over elements considered to be of secondary importance, while omitting or replacing what seems to be insignificant. His opinion on what is essential and what is insignificant is shaped by his own taste, the taste of his literary school, the taste of his historical epoch.²⁶

The elements that Maikov and Pleshcheev select, those that they omit, and those that they introduce all provide evidence of their taste and political opinions. The taste of the historical epoch also emerges in translations of poems which did not lend themselves so easily to rival political agendas. Translators from across the political spectrum responded similarly to the deceptive simplicity of Heine's style, producing translations which lacked the ambivalence and irony of the originals, but which made up for these omissions with extra helpings of pathos and sentiment. The Russians were not alone in their often rather one-dimensional reception of Heine. In Germany, where Heine was imitated, not translated, there could be no question of a language barrier as such, yet his German imitators revealed the same kinds of misunderstanding which his Russian translators were to demonstrate later on. Numerous German poets modelled their work on *Buch der Lieder*, but according to one scholar, 'its influence on German literature turned out to be disastrous: lacking the complexity of his character, missing his ambivalence, misunderstanding his irony, Heine's German imitators succumbed all too easily to those twin dangers of sentimentality and cynicism which their great model had—usually for legitimate purposes—deliberately skirted'.²⁷ While Heine's ambivalence was discarded by Russian translators who had a mission to pin the poet down on one side or the other of the literary debate, it was often omitted from translations of poems with a less obviously political agenda, on themes of love and nature.

²⁵ 'Voz'mi baraban i ne boisia', *Izbrannoe*, p. 348.

²⁶ Mikhail Gasparov, 'Sonety Shekspira — perevody Marshaka', *O russkoi poezii* (St Petersburg: Azbuka, 2001), p. 407.

²⁷ S. S. Praver, *Heine: Buch der Lieder* (London: Arnold, 1960), p. 9.

Translators frequently excluded formal elements which convey ambivalence, such as the stylistic dissonance created by selective use of colloquial language.

In 'Still ist die Nacht, es ruhen die Gassen', mentioned briefly above, it is Romantic convention which is both evoked and challenged when Heine mixes different stylistic registers. Although the situation appears to be in line with expectations familiar from Romantic literature, as the poet returns to the site of his fruitless vigils beneath the window of his beloved, these expectations are disrupted from the outset. We are informed that the lady has gone, but the house is still there:

'Sie hat schon längst die Stadt verlassen,
Doch steht noch das Haus auf demselben Platz.'
(p. 167)

Long since she's left the city's hum
But the house still stands in the same place here.
(p. 85)

The word *doch* (but, nevertheless) implies that the fact of the house having remained in its place is thought counter to ordinary expectations. This may be read both as an indication that the speaker's powers of reasoning have been impaired by his heightened emotional state, and as a rather banal, even somewhat ridiculous, remark. The mood of the poem is subtly disrupted by the intrusion of prosaic and faulty logic. In Nikolai Ogarev's translation of the 1840s, however, the intrusive banality of the original is smoothed over to a considerable extent:

Город покинут ей давней порою,
Дом же остался, как в те времена.'²⁸

She left the town a long time ago, while the house has remained as it was then.

While Ogarev avoids the risk of bathos, and, indeed, supplies extra pathos in the fact that the house is unchanged, except for the fact that the beloved is no longer there, Aleksandr Blok makes more of the contrast between mobile beloved and her immobile home:

'Она ушла из этого дома,
А он стоит, как стоял всегда.'²⁹

Heine's third and final stanza introduces another discordant touch with its use of the faintly pejorative verb *nachäffen* (to ape), which is not quite in keeping with the language used in the speaker's initial dramatic address to his double:

'Du Doppeltgänger! du bleicher Geselle!
Was äffst du nach mein Liebesleid [. . .]?'
(p. 167)

Pale ghost, twin phantom, hell-begot!
Why do you ape the pain and woe [. . .]?'
(p. 85)

²⁸ 'Dvoynik', *Izbrannye proizvedeniia*, 2 vols (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1956), 1, 96.

²⁹ 'Tikhaia noch', na ulitsakh drema', *Sobranie sochinenii*, III, 382.

Ogarev's translation does not offer the same contrast of style. It avoids the lurking, undignified simian reference in *nachäffen*, using instead the more neutral *peredraznivat'* (to imitate):

‘Ты — мой двойник, ты — товарищ мой бледный,
Что передразнивать вздумал меня,’³⁰

You—my double, you—my pale companion, why did you take it into your head to imitate me.

Blok is not tempted down the path taken by a slightly older contemporary, Innokentii Annenskii, in whose translation the speaker asks plaintively: ‘zachem obez'ianit?’ (‘why monkey around?’), but opts instead for the verb *lomat'sia*, which has appropriate connotations of inauthenticity and excess:

‘Двойник! Ты, призрак! Иль не довольно
Ломаться в муках тех страстей?’³¹

Double! You, spectre! Isn't it enough to wallow in the torments of those passions?

The interplay of different language registers in ‘Still ist die Nacht [. . .]’, and the associated play upon Romantic convention, creates a poem of some complexity, expressing the poet's awareness of the problem of self-consciousness, which makes his own emotions, under scrutiny, appear to be painfully ridiculous and artificial. As Prawer puts it: ‘The ultimate subject of this magnificent poem is not so much grief over lost love as grief over the lost simplicity of grief’ (p. 37). In his translation, Ogarev maintains a single stylistic register throughout, and so omits the dissonant notes which transmit the complexities of the original text. Blok's later translation responds creatively to the nuanced registers of Heine's poem.

Like Ogarev, most mid-nineteenth-century Russian translators smooth over Heine's dissonant stylistic registers, so that their work conveys pathos or sentiment without the astringent irony of the German text. Their effacing of irony may be partly explained as a pragmatic response to the censors', and perhaps their own, anxiety about irony, which may well have guided them in their choice of texts. It is possible that the translators made a deliberate decision to excise effects which, in the contemporary Russian literary context, were so unfamiliar as to be stylistically undesirable. It is, however, also possible that they read Heine's numerous lyrics on nature and disappointed love without being fully aware of the ironic detachment which is conveyed by the poet's style. German readers' perception of Heine's poetry was, by the 1830s, shaped by the one-sided presentation of Heine by critics and in anthologies, so that they read it as a straightforward example of Romantic sentiment, concentrating on elements which were a familiar part of the repertoire, rather than on Heine's ironic questioning of such familiar ingredients.³² Domesticating translators are similarly predisposed to foreground the familiar and minimize or exclude aspects which are perceived as alien. The effects of domestication can be seen in

³⁰ See n. 28 above.

³¹ For Annenskii's translation, see ‘Dvoynik’, *Mastera russkogo stikhotvornogo perevoda*, ed. by Efim Etkind, 2 vols (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1968), II, 94; Blok, *Sobranie sochinenii*, III (1960), 382.

³² Gerhard Höhn, *Heine-Handbuch: Zeit, Person, Werk* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1987), p. 65.

the way Russian translators handled formal features such as Heine's frequent use of tonic versification (the lack of a constant interval between stresses, or of fixed positions in a verse line which are normally stressed). This was not reproduced by the majority of his nineteenth-century translators, with the exception of Grigor'ev. In general they preferred to adopt the syllabotonic versification commonly used in Russian poetry of the time. Translators could be cavalier in their approach to other formal matters, extending a verse line by one or more feet, or using rhyme where none was present in the original. In many respects the translators appear to have worked on the assumption that content could be separated from form, and that the latter was of secondary importance. In Heine's poetry, however, the translators' attempt to separate form and content contributed to the effects of domestication. Familiar patterns of versification went hand in hand with familiar subject matter so as to marginalize less familiar aspects such as the ironic detachment and playful questioning of literary convention which were carried in Heine's use of clashing styles.

Instead of conveying the contradictions inherent in Heine's poetry within translations of single texts, Russian translators created numerous rival versions of Heine, with confusing results:

The Russian Heine was a particular problem in the artistic development of the second half of the nineteenth century. Many poets of varying quality, different tendencies and outlooks took part in creating him [. . .] Over two or three decades countless different Heines emerged: one appeared to be an excessively sweet and sentimental imitator of the Romantics, another was the author of traditional ballads, another was an ironical sceptic, even a cynic; yet another was a fiery political satirist [. . .] The nineteenth century did not manage to put together these separate characteristics. Heine, like no other poet, turned out fragmented and trivialized.³³

The majority of Heine's poems which were selected for translation in the mid-nineteenth century were drawn from his *Buch der Lieder*, a collection which had been passed by the tsarist censor for distribution in a German edition in 1829: 'This is a collection of poems and songs by an author who is apparently still young. The majority of the poems are of no value, and we do not think that this book will find itself in great demand in Russia. The censor finds nothing to which he could take exception.'³⁴ The German edition of *Buch der Lieder* became a reliable seller in Russia, as Heine's publisher Julius Campe informed the poet in a letter of 1843.³⁵ To judge from most of the work of his Russian translators, it would appear that the censor was justified in his opinion that there was nothing in the collection to take offence at. The possibility that Heine's choice of well-worn themes served to mark his satirical intent does not seem to have struck the censor, and hardly seems to have occurred to his translators, who take his lyrical effusions at face value, seeing them as unconnected with his more obviously ironic satirical works.

The radicals of the 1860s mocked conservative translators for their sentimental version of the poet, arguing that this was a ploy to deflect readers from

³³ Efim Etkind, introduction to *Mastera russkogo stikhotvornogo perevoda*, 1, 66.

³⁴ Quoted in Prawer, p. 35.

³⁵ Quoted in *Heinrich Heine: Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe der Werke*, ed. by Manfred Windfuhr, 2 vols (Düsseldorf: Hoffmann und Campe, 1975), 1/2, Buch der Lieder: Apparat, p. 617.

engaging with his 'more serious texts'.³⁶ Nevertheless, their response to the sentimental aspects of his lyrics on love and nature suggests that this made up a large part of Heine's appeal. Dobroliubov's diary of January 1857 records his early response to the poet's work:

For several days I have been reading Heine and am enthralled by him. No other poet has as yet made such a complete, profound, heartfelt impression on me. [...] Reading him expands the universe of the soul, his song echoes in the heart as sweet, quiet, thoughtful yearning [...] Heine also has [...] a fearful side, ironically desperate, mockingly joyless pieces [...] but those are not the pieces which have struck me now so particularly. Now with a special painful pleasure I read and reread the *Intermezzo*. It must be that I have now really attained a phase in my life which is full, vibrant with love and despair, with all life's joys and sorrows. My heart beats especially forcefully at this thought: I am in a state of passionate and ardent expectation.³⁷

Dobroliubov's unease about Heine's irony goes hand in hand with an unqualified acceptance of love lyrics which he assumes to be untainted by irony or equivocation. The words of the translator Mikhail Mikhailov in his 1858 foreword to a volume of translations from Heine suggest that he believes Heine's treatment of nature to be immediate and unmediated: 'The poet's tears cause fragrant roses to grow; his sighs turn into a choir of nightingales. He immerses his soul in the lily's blossom, and the scented lily echoes with a song about his beloved.'³⁸

Mikhailov sees immediacy of feeling and expression where the original is in fact dealing in the quality of literariness, and in the highly self-conscious reuse of received material derived from folk song, something that characterizes the work of many German poets of the 1820s.³⁹ Like Mikhailov, Heine's other mid-nineteenth-century Russian translators tend to show a lingering Romantic belief in the hero's bond with a sympathetic nature, and take simplicity as an indication of unmediated emotion. Heine's poetry, however, only imitates the simplicity and immediacy associated with folk culture. His writing is far from being artless. He was interested in folk song as a 'response to the cultural and social alienation of the age', but his own poems remind the reader that they are the work of modern urban man, who both experiences and observes the experience of emotion.⁴⁰ Literary imitations of Russian folk culture did not offer Heine's translators an easy equivalent to the poet's use of German folk song, and they opted to avoid Russifying stylization in favour of a more standard literary style. Rather than using folk-song commonplaces pared down to their minimum recognizable core, as Heine does, they add extraneous material, usually adjectives, which are used sparingly in the original texts. The

³⁶ Dobroliubov, 'Pesni Geine v perevode M. L. Mikhailova. SPb., 1858', *Sobranie sochinenii*, II, 489.

³⁷ Quoted by Nikolai Chernyshevskii, 'Materialy dlia biografii N. A. Dobroliubova', *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, x (1951), 58.

³⁸ Foreword to *Pesni Geine* (St Petersburg, 1858), quoted in *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii*, ed. by N. S. Ashukin (Moscow and Leningrad: Academia, 1934), p. 691.

³⁹ Michael Perraudin, *Heinrich Heine: Poetry in Context. A Study of 'Buch der Lieder'* (Oxford, New York, and Munich: Berg, 1989), p. 224.

⁴⁰ Nigel Reeves, *Heinrich Heine: Poetry and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 40.

tension between the use of obvious folk-song formulae and the modern poet's self-consciousness is lost.

One of the poems to which Mikhailov alludes in the words quoted above is a short lyric which attracted numerous Russian translators, all of whom handle it in very much the same way. The original is emphatically simple in structure and sentiments: the speaker's emotional outpourings are transformed into flowers and birdsong, to be offered to his beloved, should she return his feelings:

Aus meinen Tränen sprießen
 Viel blühende Blumen hervor,
 Und meine Seufzer werden
 Ein Nachtigallenchor.
 Und wenn du mich liebhabst, Kindchen,
 Schenk ich dir die Blumen all,
 Und vor deinem Fenster soll klingen
 Das Lied der Nachtigall.

(p. 135)

Out of my tears of yearning
 The blossoming flowers throng.
 And all my sighs are turning
 To nightingales in song.
 And if you love me, dear,
 I'll give you these blossoms pale,
 And outside your window you'll hear
 The song of the nightingale.

(p. 52)

For all the appearance of artlessness, the poem is, as Nigel Reeves puts it, 'clearly contrived', an assemblage of folk-song commonplaces condensed into eight lines, all superfluous elements discarded, 'less spontaneous expression than conscious construction' (p. 45). There is only one adjective, and that looks suspiciously comical, with alliteration adding to redundancy, since flowers (*Blumen*) do little else but blossom (*blühen*). The translators, however, are inspired to describe the 'blossoming flowers' as 'fragrant', 'sweet-smelling', 'luxuriant and brightly coloured'. The speakers' sighs are described as 'plaintive', and in one case become 'groans from the heart'.⁴¹ The result is pleasant enough, but it does not reproduce the original's self-conscious pose. Petr Veinberg's 1860 translation, with its additional adjectives, emphasizes emotional immediacy rather than the self-conscious reuse of folk-song formulae:

Из слез моих выходит много
 Благоухающих цветов,
 И стоны сердца переходят
 В хор сладкозвучных соловьев.
 Люби меня, и подарю я,
 Дитя, тебе цветы мои,

⁴¹ Russian translations of 'Aus meinen Tränen sprießen' by N. Dobroliubov, 'Из слез моikh vykhodit mnogo', *Sobranie sochinenii*, VIII, 88–89; Afanasii Fet, 'Из слез моikh mnogo rodit-sia', *Stikhotvoreniia, poemy, perevody* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Pravda', 1995), p. 437; Aleksandr Mikhailov, 'Из слез моikh mnogo, maliutka', *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvoreniï*, p. 264.

И под окошками твоими
Зальются звонко соловьи.⁴²

From my tears emerge many fragrant-smelling flowers, and the groans of my heart become a choir of sweet-sounding nightingales. Love me, my child, and I shall give you my flowers, and beneath your windows the nightingales will burst into resounding song.

Mid-nineteenth-century Russian critics reviewed new translations from Heine without a great deal of serious discussion of their merits and shortcomings. On the whole, reviews contained either dismissive criticism or fulsome praise of a translator's work, depending on whether the translator had conveyed a version of Heine which was amenable to the reviewer's own preconceptions. Dobroliubov opened one review with the following words: 'There is a facsimile of an extremely well-executed portrait of Heine appended to this volume. It is this portrait which forms the most valuable aspect of the volume, which, by the way, is most elegant in appearance. [. . .] But one shouldn't judge by appearances: this whited sepulchre contains only the dead bones of Heine's poetry.'⁴³ Dobroliubov concluded his review by quoting one poem in its entirety, calling the translation 'vulgar and coarse', and noting its close literal adherence to the original, but did not go into any detailed discussion of specific faults. Mikhailov's translations were singled out for praise, as, in Dobroliubov's opinion, they successfully conveyed the mood of the original.⁴⁴ The most thoughtful comments on contemporary translations came from Pisarev, who, like Dobroliubov, had translated Heine himself. Pisarev pointed out what was lost when the poems were translated piecemeal rather than in cycles, as Heine had arranged them. Heine's nature, he said, 'emerges precisely through the way in which these poems are connected one to another'.⁴⁵ Of all the nineteenth-century translators, only Mikhailov seems to have understood the importance of the cycle in Heine's poetry, although he arranged his translations in new cycles, rather than adhering strictly to the original scheme. Poems translated piecemeal, as the majority of them were in Russia at the time, were deprived of their position in the narrative, among poems which offered contrasting points of view and a context for interpretation. Moreover, poems translated in isolation could more easily be made to serve as a vehicle for the translator's particular concerns, as has been shown above in discussion of Maikov's translation of 'Nun ist es Zeit, daß mit Verstand' ('It's time I took good sense to heart'). As well as identifying the key role of the cycle in Heine's poetry, Pisarev also noted the importance of Heine's style, and in a review of 1862 criticized translators' inability to render it effectively: 'In any of Heine's poems which is at all typical of his work the most significant feature is either left out altogether, or distorted in the most inhuman way.' He went on to say: 'where in Heine there is irony, the translation has naive attempts at originality, which has no idea of its own significance; where in Heine there is genuine emotional restraint, the translation has a distorted and watered-down imitation

⁴² Petr Veinberg, in *Mastera stikhotvornogo perevoda*, II, 29.

⁴³ 'Stikhotvoreniiia iz Geine: perevod I. Genslera. "Snovideniia". SPb, 1857', *Sobranie sochinenii*, II, 280.

⁴⁴ 'Pesni Geine v perevode M. L. Mikhailova. SPb., 1858', *Sobranie sochinenii*, II, 489–90.

⁴⁵ 'Vol'nye russkie perevodchiki', *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, II, 242.

of an original which has not been understood.⁴⁶ Pisarev noted the genuine difficulties which Heine's style presented to his Russian translators, saying: 'Anyone who is even slightly familiar with Heine will know very well that it is quite impossible to imitate him; his turns of phrase and forms are so eccentric and capricious that it is only our poet's colossal talent which saves them from appearing hideous.' He called Heine 'untranslatable', claiming that his Russian translators were working with 'imitation Heine, like cabinet-makers' work with imitation walnut'.⁴⁷ Such comments could be seen to pre-empt Blok's claim of 1919 that 'the Russian language still hardly knows Heine at all'.⁴⁸

In spite of the criticisms aimed at translations of Heine's poetry, it was unquestionably popular. 'Imitation Heine' found a ready audience, who may have been attracted by the emphasis on sentiment, and by the mellifluous qualities of the numerous translations which were set to music. The radicals, for all their indignation over the 'sentimental Heine' put forward by their opponents, may have been inclined to overlook sentimental excess in their own translations, because of what D. S. Mirsky calls 'a degree of reverence for certain foreign reputations, especially for those which were in some way or other connected with revolution'.⁴⁹ It seems likely, however, that Heine's popularity did not depend entirely, or perhaps even principally, on the translations of his poetry, but on the various 'images' which had been constructed around him. The radicals found in Heine a fellow revolutionary, but the Heine who existed in the popular imagination seems to have been principally a poet of sentiment or a lightweight wit, something which they comment on with some disappointment. Dobroliubov wrote in 1858 that for too many readers, poetry in the style of Heine was understood to run along the following lines: "The brook murmurs peacefully, but I am unhappy,—I am remembering what my dear faithless one used to say". Or: "The clouds rush across the sky; I look at them and think that they are not clouds, but the soul of my beloved"; or further: "My beloved and I sat talking tenderly, and cats miaowed on the roof".⁵⁰ Popular understanding of Heine did not progress far over the next decade, to judge from a review of an 1870 edition of Heine, in which N. Shelgunov regretted that too many Russian readers had a false picture of Heine as 'an amusing fellow'.⁵¹ Many imitators copied his technique of undermining the sentiments of an opening stanza in an ironic second stanza, and were in turn satirized for over-use of this tactic as a hackneyed indicator of wit, as in these lines by Dmitrii Minaev:

Я постиг отлично тайну,
Как писать оригинально:
Стих начну высокопарно,
А окончу — тривиально.⁵²

⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 242–43.

⁴⁷ 'Berlin: osenniaia skazka Genrikha Geine', *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 1, 531.

⁴⁸ See n. 10 above.

⁴⁹ *A History of Russian Literature* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), p. 232.

⁵⁰ 'Pesni Geine v perevode M. L. Mikhailova. SPb., 1858', *Sobranie sochinenii*, II, 489.

⁵¹ 'Genii molodoi Germanii: sochineniia Genrikh Geine v perevode russkikh pisatelei, pod redaktsiei Petra Veinberga', *Delo*, 10 (1870), 27, quoted by Ia. I. Gordon, *Heine in Rußland*, p. 12.

⁵² 'Nevskii al'bom', *Budil'nik*, 28 (1865), 112, quoted by Ia. I. Gordon, *Heine in Rußland*, p. 193.

I've found an excellent solution to the mystery of how to write with originality: I start a verse in high-flown style, and end in triviality.

A. K. Tolstoi produced some effective translations of Heine's poetry, but in his capacity as one of the authors who created the leaden-footed literary lion Kuz'ma Prutkov he wrote short poems in the manner of Heine's imitators which encapsulate and ridicule the popular view of Heine's muse. Prutkov's 'Tunker Shmidt' appeared in 1854, circumventing the ban on Heine which was still in force. It resembles Heine's work in its brevity and lack of verbosity, something which the translators of Heine did not always achieve. Yet it also displays the shortcomings of an amateurish translation, as the stress on the word *chestnoe* in the penultimate line is switched from the first to the second syllable in order to conform to the metre. Prutkov reproduces the device, often used by Heine's imitators, of deflating readers' expectations, as the eponymous hero's thoughts of suicide brought on by the start of winter are cheerfully resolved by the poet's reassurance that summer will return.⁵³ Another of Prutkov's alleged translations from Heine, 'Doblestnye stud'ozusy' ('Brilliant students'), turns on an appalling pun, playing on the word *oboi* to mean both 'both' and 'wallpaper'. When the speaker is asked to decide which of two students is the most outstanding, he replies:

Я комнату взглядом окинул
И, будто узором прельщен,
«Мне нравятся очень *обои!*» —
Сказал им и выбежал вон.⁵⁴

I cast my eye round the room, and, as if enchanted by the pattern, said to them: 'I very much like you both/the wallpaper', and ran away.

Prutkov may exemplify popular trivialized perceptions of Heine, yet Tolstoi shows flexibility and wit to rival Heine's own, as well as an appropriately satirical approach to representatives of the bourgeoisie.

Heine the amusingly witty poet somehow coexisted with the radicals' 'martyr of the age', and with the author of sentimental verses. Between them the censors, the translators, and the market shaped Russian translation of Heine's poetry. Interest in his work declined after the 1870s, but revived in the early years of the twentieth century, sparked both by the 1905 Revolution, whose supporters enlisted Heine as one of their own, and by the emergence of a new generation of modernist poets. Among them were Aleksandr Blok and Innokentii Annenskii, both of whom translated Heine. Later on, in the 1920s, Iurii Tynianov would produce brilliant translations of his satirical poetry. Early twentieth-century experiments in poetic form, particularly by the Futurists, equipped translators with the means they needed to do justice to Heine's flexible and

⁵³ 'Tunker Shmidt', *Sochineniia Koz'my Prutkova* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1960), p. 18. The poem in fact resembles Heine's 'Das Fräulein stand am Meere' (*Sämtliche Gedichte in zeitlicher Folge*, p. 352), in which the speaker reassures a young lady, moved by the sight of the sunset, that the sun will rise again the following day. For more on Prutkov and Heine, see Barbara Heldt Monter, *Koz'ma Prutkov: The Art of Parody* (The Hague: Mouton, 1972), pp. 80–81, 87–91.

⁵⁴ 'Doblestnye stud'ozusy', *Sochineniia Koz'my Prutkova*, pp. 40–41.

colloquial turns of style.⁵⁵ They were also able to embrace Heine's ambivalence, his disillusion, his realization of modern humanity's inner divisions. In the mid-nineteenth century translators had moved Heine's texts closer to the reader; by the early twentieth century the Russian reader had moved towards Heine, whose modernity now became fully evident. The Heine that emerged in early twentieth-century Russia was in tune with the times, but also far more in tune with the original.

UNIVERSITY OF EXETER

KATHARINE HODGSON

⁵⁵ See Efim Etkind, '“Veselyi primer Geine”: Geine — Tynianov — Maiakovskii', *Tam — vnutri: o russkoi poezii XX veka* (St Petersburg: Maksima, 1995), pp. 313–40.